

6/22/74

Dear Mr. Phillips,

I get many concerned letters like yours of the 19th. I can't make adequate response and still do any work. And being honest may be mistaken, may be taken for other than what it is, simple honesty without diplomatic phrasing, because I just do not have the time. I still work a longer day than anyone I know.

(Even Nixon's lawyers, and I don't know them.)

I am broke so I have not been able to publish anything new. If and when we can and do we will let you know, as we will everyone on our mailing list.

The people who bring you the garbage about the Hickses and the Sanatanis belong in isolation after confinement. They are rabid. Also sincere, which does not reduce the insanity. Do you suppose that if Garrison had legitimate confessions he would not have put the live witnesses on the stand? Or is he had anything he was not ashamed of he would have held it back? The tragic truth is he was a loud-talking, big-talking dissembler who made no real investigation of his own and destroyed the credibility of those who did, simultaneously turning all the major media off and convincing it that everyone had as little and spoke as exaggeratedly.

I haven't heard from him in years. Last I heard he was back in private practise. He could be a very good lawyer. He has an exceptional mind when he isn't chasing wild geese.

I don't subscribe to any of what you call the "small" papers because it is my experience that they use nonsense to attract readers, thereby imposing on the concern and trust of decent people. It does help circulation and makes the writers and editors feel important. (In every meaningful way it hurts real work and destroys more credibility.) I know of what it prints only that of which I am sent copies. I recall no single worthwhile, responsible article. Those insanities you cite about Watergaters in Dealey Plaza, the nineteenth version of the same pictures, is a case in point.

It is my investigation, largely in Frame-Up, of which I suppose I sent you excerpts from a review and an order blank, that underlies the Ray defense. I have no idea who the real killers were or for whom they worked. Except for those involved, I don't know anyone who has a basis for claiming he knows. The Ray case is on its way to an evidentiary hearing. If we win there the next step is a trial, unless the State stalls more with other appeals based on nothing but the need to stall. If we get into court I don't see how he can be convicted. Not even how the case can go to the jury, there is that little, none of which stacks up.

But don't be discouraged. We'll yet overcome the self-advertisin nuts and the officially dishonest.

Best regards,